

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, the VA-HUD bill that we are considering today is unacceptable. At a time of unprecedented economic prosperity, the question is: Why is it that we are cutting the supply of affordable housing instead of increasing the supply of affordable housing?

The cuts proposed by the Republicans will be devastating to our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. The majority proposes to cut \$1.6 billion below last year's levels. The VA-HUD bill does not include any of President Clinton's requests for new housing and economic development assistance, such as 100,000 new Section 8 vouchers, APIC, which is America's Private Investment Companies, and other initiatives.

In the City of Chicago, these cuts would deprive 2,530 people of jobs; 1,915 people of affordable housing; and deny assistance to 397 homeless families and persons with AIDS. It is estimated that the City of Chicago will lose \$33,975,000 as a result of the VA-HUD cuts.

My constituents are asking, what is going on here in Washington? Well, I will tell what is going on here.

The proponents of this huge tax cut are looking for ways to pay for their plan for their wealthiest supporters. Unfortunately, they chose to do this on the backs of the poor, our most vulnerable citizens. I urge my Republican colleagues to fully fund VA-HUD. We must expand, not cut, the programs that meet vital housing and economic development needs of our most vulnerable citizens.

TAX RELIEF, IT IS GOOD FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address tonight the Republican budget and the tax relief package which Americans certainly deserve and is long overdue to them and particularly in respect to the rhetorical terrorism that we seem to hear from the White House.

I guess it is the fall. Everybody is back on the football field. The kids are back in school and the White House hot air machine is in full force spreading the lies which they seem to be so good about. Now here we have a budget which is a three-point budget, Mr. Speaker; and basically what it does, as a triangle, the apex of the triangle does one thing, protects Social Security and Medicare, setting aside \$1.9 trillion for Social Security and Medicare protection. Unlike the President's proposal that he made in January of this year, standing right in front of where the Speaker is, saying let us put aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus, the Republican plan puts aside 100 percent.

Now, even if someone is a liberal over at the White House, they know that 100 percent is more than 62 percent, and this is good for your grandmother and my grandmother.

So we have the first point, Social Security and Medicare is protected, \$1.9 trillion under the Republican plan.

The second corner of the triangle is to pay down the debt, \$2.2 trillion to pay down the debt. This budget allows us to look one's grandmother in the eye and say we are taking care of them and also look our children in the eye and say we are taking care of their future.

Now we had a \$5 trillion debt. I would love to see us pay all of that off but, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the votes are not there. The political will is not there. I would love to see the money go to debt reduction, but the math in terms of getting 200 votes in the House, 51 in the Senate and the signature of the White House is just not there. So we do have some debt reduction.

Now, after we have paid that portion of the debt down in installments, it triggers tax relief, not only afterwards. So we have the \$2.2 trillion in debt relief. Then we get \$792 billion in tax relief. The way I look at that, Mr. Speaker, if someone goes to Wal-Mart and they buy a \$7 hammer, and they give the cashier \$10 they expect their change. They do not expect the cashier to load their cart up with more goods and services.

Yet that is what the liberals over at the White House want to do. They say the American people do not deserve their change back for their hard-earned pay, and I think that they do.

This change, this tax relief, is in the form of capital gains tax relief, 20 to 18 percent; if someone is in the lower income bracket, 10 to 7 percent. Income tax relief across the board, 2.9 percent for upper income, 7 percent for lower income. Death tax relief so that if a person dies they can pass their small business or family farm on to their children so that they too can carry on the family enterprise; and then marriage tax relief.

It is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, that we live in a society that says, if people get married they are going to pay more in taxes than if they are just living together, and yet we out of the other side of our mouth are talking about what a great institution marriage is. These are common sense, across-the-board, middle-class tax reductions, one thing the Democrats have trouble understanding.

They say, yes, but the rich are going to get money out of the tax relief.

□ 2045

Well, as my colleagues know. Hello? Who pays taxes? If you pay taxes, you are going to get tax relief; I am sorry, there is no way around it. But that seems to be the concept wasted over there at the White House.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that takes care of Social Security and Medicare first, debt relief second, and after that and only after that, tax relief for the hard-working middle-class Americans. It is a good budget.

The President says he wants a budget that takes care of Social Security, Medicare, and debt relief. This is the budget for him to sign. I wish that he would sign it because do my colleagues know what, Mr. Speaker? We do not really have to be here. If the President would go ahead and say: You know what, this is a common sense budget; and I agree with my Democrat comrade and friend, Senator Bob KERREY, the liberal senator who said this is reasonable, and I am going to support it. And if he could, we would go home, and we would not be passing a whole bunch of other new laws and regulations that are crippling American industry, American education, and school systems and hurting middle-class Americans.

And that would be the greatest part. We could all go home, and I do not think there is anybody outside of Washington, D.C., who would regret Congress adjourning early.

So, Mr. Speaker, with that let me just say I urge the President to get off the rhetoric, I urge the President to get into reality, and I urge him to sign this bill. But if he does not, at least sit down in good faith, and let us try to work out something because the American taxpayers deserve it.

CHUMP CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me in the well said it very well. He said he talked about American people getting change back, and that, in fact, is what the Republican tax bill would provide for the vast majority of Americans. He then went on to say:

Hello? Should not the wealthy people get back more? They pay more.

But guess what? They have already gotten their tax cuts.

A study that was just published yesterday and is coming to the attention of the Congress and the American people shows that because of the tax cuts back in the 1970s and the 1980s the wealthiest 1 percent of the American people have already realized an average tax cut of \$40,000 a year from their 1977 tax rate, \$40,000 a year. That is more than two-thirds of the American people earn for an entire year let alone pay in taxes, and he is saying: Of course those people should get more tax relief.

Why should they get more tax relief? Their average tax bill is already greatly reduced from the tax bill that was assessed against those same incomes in this country 20 years ago.